

PATENT

Docket No.: NL000441

Customer No. 000024737

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5 have been amended. Claims 1-13 remain in the application. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the Final Action, and allowance of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

In the specification of the above-identified application, at least on page 2, lines 4-13; and on page 8, lines 20-32, the applicant provides a discussion of a device including a transmissive LCD display panel and back-lighting means. The present claimed invention is distinguished over such devices including transmissive LCD display panels, as discussed in the specification and as claimed, and further as discussed herein. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended herein to more clearly point out and distinctly claim that which the applicant believes patentable over the cited art. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the specification on page 4, lines 22-25; page 6, lines 19-24, 30; and on page 9, lines 21-22. Claims 2-5 have been amended for clarification.

Advantages provided by the present claimed invention are discussed in the specification at least on page 3, lines 1-6; page 7, lines 31-33; and page 8, lines 1-2.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites an image-sensing display device comprising: an image display part including a reflective image display panel and a front-lighting means for illuminating the reflective display panel only during a display mode of the image-sensing display device; and an image-sensing part arranged on top of the reflective display panel of the

PATENT

D ck t No.: NL000441

Customer No. 000024737

image display part and for use during an imaging mode of the image-sensing display device, the image-sensing part including a two-dimensional array of photosensitive elements, wherein the front-lighting means of the image display part is arranged in front of the array of photosensitive elements on top of the reflective display panel and wherein the photosensitive elements of the image-sensing part and the reflective display panel and front-lighting means of the image display part are integrated in one module.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rostoker (U.S. Patent No. 5,977,535) in view Umemoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,692 B1). Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP § 2142:

... The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness...

It is submitted that, in the present case, the examiner has not factually supported a prima facie case of obviousness for at least the following, mutually exclusive, reasons.

1. Even When Combined, the References Do Not Teach the Claimed Subject Matter

The Rostoker and Umemoto patents cannot be applied to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 which provides that:

A patent may not be obtained ... if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

PATENT

Docket No.: NL000441

Customer No. 000024737

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains ... (Emphasis added)

Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated. However, since neither Rostoker nor Umemoto teaches an image-sensing display device with an image display part and an image sensing part, the image display part including a reflective image display panel and a front-lighting means, the front-lighting means for illuminating the reflective display panel only during a display mode of the image-sensing display device and the image-sensing part arranged on top of the reflective display panel of the image display part and for use during an imaging mode of the image-sensing display device, the image-sensing part including a two-dimensional array of photosensitive elements, wherein the front-lighting means of the image display part is arranged in front of the array of photosensitive elements on top of the reflective display panel and wherein the photosensitive elements of the image-sensing part and the reflective display panel and front-lighting means of the image display part are integrated in one module as is claimed in claim 1, it is impossible to render the subject matter of claim 1 as a whole obvious, and the explicit terms of the statute cannot be met.

Thus, for this mutually exclusive reason, the examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

2. Prior Art That Teaches Away From the Claimed Invention Cannot be Used to Establish Obviousness

In the present case the Rostoker reference, by providing back-lighting means to augment a visibility of an image on the LCD panel, is directed to a system in which the LCD panel is transmissive. As indicated above, the invention of the present application is directed towards a reflective display panel and is distinguished from transmissive display panels. In addition, as noted by the Examiner, "Rostoker discloses alternate

PATENT

Docket No.: NL000441

Customer No. 000024737

embodiments but does not explicitly disclose a reflective display panel wherein the lighting means are front-lighting means which are arranged in front of the array of photosensitive elements on top of the reflective display panel." Thus, the system of Rostoker clearly teaches away from the reflective display panel of claim 1, recited above.

Since it is well recognized that teaching away from the claimed invention is a *per se* demonstration of lack of *prima facie* obviousness, it is clear that the examiner has not borne the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

Thus, for this reason alone, the examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

3. The references are not properly combinable if their intended function is destroyed

It is clear that the Rostaker and Umemoto patents are not properly combinable since, if combined, their intended function is destroyed. More particularly, if the Rostaker patent were modified with the surface light source device of Umemoto, as required by the rejection, it would be rendered inoperable for its intended purpose because the transmissive LCD panel would not reflect light, and a visibility of an image on the LCD panel would be diminished instead of augmented. As indicated herein above, Rostaker teaches a transmissive display panel, which teaches away from a reflective display panel.

Thus, since this modification of the Rostaker patent clearly destroys the purpose or function of the invention disclosed in the patent, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found a reason to make the claimed modification.

PATENT
Docket No.: NL000441
Customer No. 000024737

Thus, for this mutually exclusive reason, the examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

4. The Combination of References is Improper

Assuming, arguendo, that none of the above arguments for non-obviousness apply (which is clearly not the case based on the above), there is still another, mutually exclusive, and compelling reason why the Rostoker and Umemoto patents cannot be applied to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

§ 2142 of the MPEP also provides:

...the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made.....The examiner must put aside knowledge of the applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole'.

Here, neither Rostoker and Umemoto teaches, or even suggests, the desirability of the combination since neither teaches the specific arrangement and location of the reflective display panel, array of photosensitive elements, and front-lighting means, in addition wherein the photosensitive elements of the image-sensing part and the reflective display panel and front-lighting means of the image display part are integrated in one module, as specified above and as claimed in claim 1. As discussed in the specification of the present application on at least page 3, lines 1-6; page 4, lines 1-3; page 7, lines 31-33; and page 8, lines 1-2, integration of the camera function and the display function in one module provides the advantage that signal processing (for example, first processing and interpretation) and video processing (for example, correction and coding) can be carried out by an on-board processor of the module. Thereby, a huge amount of data transmission to and from the board processor can be avoided which saves power consumption and increases data rate. An additional advantage of integration is that freedom of design is enhanced. Furthermore, the

PATENTDocket No.: NL000441
Customer No. 000024737

invention can be integrated with other circuitry on a single chip and provides reduced packaging costs. Advantages also include an efficient use of light, and thus power of the battery that supplies power to the front-lighting means, as well as constructional aspects of the image-sensing display device of the present invention.

Thus, it is clear that neither patent provides any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination. Therefore, there is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

In this context, the MPEP further provides at § 2143.01:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.

In the above context, the courts have repeatedly held that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination.

In the present case it is clear that the examiner's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing, suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination as applied to claim 1. Therefore, for this mutually exclusive reason, the examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-13 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings, therefore, no new matter is introduced.

PATENT

Docket No.: NL000441

Customer No. 000024737

Withdrawal of the final action and an early formal notice of allowance of claims
1-13 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291

Dated: 6/12/03

21004 Lakeshore Dr. W.
Spicewood, Texas 78669
Telephone: 512/461-2624
Facsimile: 512/264-3687
File: NL000441

a-32658.29

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:

Fax Number: (703) 872-9319

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

TYPE OR PRINT NAME

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

SIGNATURE

6/12/03

DATE OF TRANSMISSION

FAX RECEIVED
JUN 12 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800